



*Honor Code
Referendum
Thursday, Feb. 2
In Lobby
8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.*

The Kentucky Commentator

University of Kentucky College of Law

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

A PUBLICATION OF THE STUDENT BAR ASSOCIATION

FEBRUARY, 1967

An Honor Code For The Law School

By HENRY ROSENTHAL

Webster defines honor as "adherence to high standards of justice and responsibilities; ethical conduct." Furthermore he defines honor system as specifically "A system of conducting examinations without faculty supervision." Within honor systems there are honor codes, the basic difference being in most instances that codes set forth written principles and systems exist as more or less an intangible "thing."

The proposal before the student body of the University of Kentucky College of Law is one in written form much like a legislative proposal but goes beyond Webster's definition of an honor system as far as faculty supervision is concerned.

Honor Codes and systems have existed for many, many years within the legal profession. For examples, all members of the Bar are expected to uphold the canons of legal ethics. But, the question with an honor code is, "Does this code of ethics apply to the prospective lawyer?" At first glance it would so appear, but there is more to the matter than meets the eye.

With the instigation of an honor code two basic doctrines come into conflict. One, for broad and practical purposes will be called "Thou Shall not Cheat, etc." The other embodies the "Thou Shall not Squeal" doctrine. The "Thou Shall not Squeal Doctrine" is enforced by what are often referred to as "rat fink" clauses. More appropriate these are mandatory reporting clauses.

Doctrines Collide

It is very odd that these two doctrines should collide, but the "squeal doctrine" is a carry over from at least sixteen years of schooling where many ethical practices have gone out the window. The "non-cheating" doctrine is for most people, on an institutional basis, a relatively new thing. It was only recently that the University issued a prospective code of conduct. Up until now honor has been more or less a personal thing or a private possession.

For these reasons the adoption of an honor code should be given great thought. Other questions soon develop. What role does the faculty play? What actually is aid during an examination? Is it implied that all who enter the law school subscribe to the honor code? Will students refrain from acting over-zealously? Are the students a gestapo for the faculty?

First in the honor code, the faculty will play very little part. Therefore it may be concluded that there is no appeal to a higher court. If the honor code is adopted trial by peers could exist completely.

As far as aid goes, what may be aid to one person may not be aid to

another especially when open book tests are taken.

A more far-reaching question which goes to the very heart of the honor code concerns the implied subscription. At many law schools pledges are signed by each student.

Often this does not work out. Rutgers has such a program and its student newspaper has called this a waste of energy. Two points were made. Under this system names were posted of those signing the honor code. Thus nonsigner would sit together. Besides that, it was pointed out that hardly anyone would let it be known publicly that he would NOT sign an honor code. The main reason for the signing of the pledge is to publicize the honor code says the Rutgers newspaper.

Convocation Held

At the University a convocation was held to discuss the matter. As years go by—if the honor code is adopted—this will develop into more or less a formality for the first year students, but this year is an exception. Until based on tradition an honor code may be weak and people may be opposed to it.

One of the older honor systems exists at the University of Virginia Law School. It might be pointed out that a pledge is signed. At Virginia the honor system came into existence in the 1830's and has stood the test of time. While the code proposed for UK contains various and sundry sanctions, the Virginia system has only two alternatives. One, a person is completely innocent and, two, he is dishonorably discharged from the institution. The basic concern at Virginia is the lack of an appeal to a higher administrative body.

It is quite possible that upon entrance to the Law School a person might by implication be granted a hearing by a faculty committee because the proposed code makes recommended sanction to the Dean. From this it might be gathered that the Dean could conduct further investigations if he so desires.

Why?

To go to a more basic point: Why do we want an honor system? On this matter there are at least two possibilities. It would be quite embarrassing if the first is the reason. Honor codes are adopted when moral decay has become evident. Hopefully, this is not our situation. Secondly, honor codes reflect well upon an institute and its students. A school having a well-developed honor code is in most instances highly-regarded and respected.

In defense of the students at the University Law School and to point up the second possibility it should be said that many examinations are now unproctored. This does of itself say that the students

here are in most instances honorable men—or at least so faculty members think. This is not to say that cheating does not exist especially on objective rather than the traditional essay test. Many faculty members simply will not proctor an exam. Seeing cheating and proving cheating are two different things.

The procedural safeguards are very tight and conviction of the innocent would be highly improbable. It takes a unanimous vote of a Committee of nine for conviction. Anything less the hearing is terminated and the party is deemed innocent. All records are destroyed. Some persons have said that no one would be convicted under the code.

One very tangible aspect concerns library violations. Removal of books without authorization constitutes an offense.

One recommendation in the honor code is that all doors available to the faculty will be available to students as far as entrances to the library go.

As it is now students—while there is a desk clerk—are virtually on their own to come and go to the library as they please—and a number of problems exist. Experiments have proven that books may be easily removed from the library. An honor system may or may not solve this problem.

It might be said that law students at the University are already on an implied honor system based on personal integrity. The only break down probably is in the "rat fink" clause. And it is probably upon this point that the code will pass or fail.

From Africa To UK: Prof. Sedler's Journey

From Ethiopia to office 203 in the Law Building is a long way, but visiting Prof. Robert Sedler has traveled the distance during his teaching career.

No castaway in Ethiopia, Sedler went to the African country to instruct at the Haile Selassie II University which had installed its law school in 1963. At the time of the founding of the law school there, much of the legal work in the country was done by untrained people.

While the university appropriated substantial funds for the law school, it was necessary to employ substantial external assistance. The Institute of International Education provided funds for salaries of many of the faculty, the Ford Founda-



PROF. ROBERT SEDLER

tion gave a generous research grant and an equally generous library grant, and assistance was provided in varying degrees by the American, British, Canadian, French, Belgian and German governmental agencies as well as by other groups in the United States.

The Impetus

"The main impetus in the founding of the law school were the new codes," Prof. Sedler said. "Ethiopia modeled its legal system after the western mode, but lacked the trained personnel to operate the system efficiently." Prior to the founding of the law school there were less than 30 lawyers in the country.

"Despite the lack of trained personnel, the Ethiopian system still proved that in the absence of trained lawyers things do get done," Prof. Sedler commented.

Much of the teaching at the law school had to be improvised. Prof. Sedler pointed out that there were few cases reported and a scant amount of written material. One thing that complicated matters was a language barrier. English is a "second" language to the Ethiopians.

Because there is such a need for trained personnel admission requirements are not the same as they would be in the United States. The law school required that students have two rather than four years of college.

However, since secondary school education is not of the same quality as that in the United States, it is accurate to say that after two years of college students are comparable to students en-

Continued On Page 4

EDITORIALS

Recently the Kentucky Law Journal amended its selection of candidate method because of a discrepancy in the grade average for the two sections of the first year class. The new requirements are that candidates be in the top fifteen in their section of the class.

This is a tangible result of one of the inadequacies of the section method of class division. Grade average is just one of the problems presented by the sectionalizing method. It is the most controversial because it is "dearest to the heart."

From the time the grades were announced many person—especially those who felt they came out the worst—have asked why this imbalance in grading existed. Several propositions have been advanced: different teaching methods, different methods of testing, to mention two. Regardless of the reason for the difference in grade averages, under the present sectionalizing method there will always be certain inequalities.

As certain members of the faculty have pointed out, "actually we run two law schools here." This has been true since the sectionalizing of classes began three years ago. It was not until this year that a major discrepancy arose in the grading scale of the various sections. It may have been that the grading of both sections was unjust, or, on the other hand, both sections might have received too high an average. There are many possibilities.

It is seriously doubted that this situation will crop up again. The faculty has already taken notice of the situation and will undoubtedly take steps to guard against its recurrence. There are various measures that might be applied.

The simplest would be to have the faculty adhere to a mandatory grade average for each class. This would mathematically guard against any inequalities. Perhaps, this should be applied no matter what steps are taken to equalize the grading process.

Other methods to improve grading uniformity would be to have the same instructor grade all the papers for a particular course. Also, a disinterested party might grade the papers.

The sectionalizing system has had another apparent breakdown. The size of the two sections in the second year are vastly different. For one reason or another two sections which started out equally in the first year have now changed so that there is no comparison in class size. If the section method is to be used it is necessary that sections remain the same size.

Section division of classes also brings a section into contact with virtually the same instructors for the first two years. While sound arguments can be made for this, there should be some form of exposure to other instructors who teach the same material. This would prevent a stereotyped class and would balance out idiosyncracies of both student and instructor.

Since the sectionalizing plan is necessary in a school of this size because of scheduling problems it is not feasible to abandon it, however, there are certain modifications that should be made.

To The Alumni

As one of the objectives of the COMMENTATOR we hope to communicate as readily as possible with the alumni. Realizing that we have certain gaps in our coverage for the alumni we would appreciate suggestions from our Law school graduates.

While the COMMENTATOR also reaches the student, it is obvious that there are far more alumni than students. It is our intention to provide as much material that will interest both groups as possible.

We would appreciate your response and suggestions.

Mitch McConnell

From The President

Editor's note: Mitch McConnell, president of the SBA, has invited John Lackey, a member of the Student Bar Association Honor Code Committee, to express the views of the Committee on this matter.

To the members of the student body of the College of Law:

I have been asked to write a letter explaining in some fashion the objectives and operation of the proposed Honor Code as envisioned by the drafting committee. The following paragraphs are submitted for that purpose.

About a year ago a committee varying in size between seven and ten members began the foundation building as to what should be the essential elements of a workable Honor Code at this College of Law. The following cornerstones were agreed upon:

1. Every conceivable procedural protection for an accused must be included.
2. Some form of mandatory reporting clause is necessary to a vital and just code.
3. The provisions for adoption, amendment, repeal must be left so liberal that no student body, present or subsequent, might ever complain that it was unjustly governed by an unwieldy or minority system.
4. The Honor Code Committee must be elected and must function independently of any other student or faculty organization.

How well the committee has succeeded in laying these cornerstones within its work is for you to decide when you vote on the proposal in the near future. Of course, this is not meant to obscure the fact that another decision must be made as to whether a student would want to live under an Honor Code at all, albeit a perfect one.

It is obvious that the benefits of an Honor Code are, by and large, pretty intangible. They come, slowly, in an enhanced respect for this college and its members by outsiders, in a student's mutual trust in the word of a fellow student, in a confidence that no one may sandbag through college on another's hard work and at many others expense under the curved grade scale.

There may also be several, more tangible benefits which we hope to be able to present to you when you receive a copy of the code; these benefits would not be sufficient reason to vote for the code, if you did not believe the foregoing benefits would be obtained—or were worth obtaining.

We hope, then, that you will scrutinize the proposal with reasonable objectivity and impartiality. It is by no means a perfect Honor Code; it is perhaps the best code that the particular committee could draw up. Though the draft will remain open to constructive alteration, it will probably be presented to you in a rather finalized form.

Examine Carefully

It would be good if you would examine with some care the proposed procedures of a hearing by the Honor Committee. Several critics have suggested that the actual effect of the Code could be negligible since convictions may be well—nigh impossible. We doubt that this is so, but in any event the intent of the committee was not to depart greatly from the present code of ethics of this college.

An honor code can have no true vitality unless it is supported by a strong majority of those who live under it. It cannot rely on fear to accomplish its ends. If it seeks to do so, the "honor" becomes hypocrisy. Though we do not try to hide the fact that the duty of enforcement would fall on every student, we anticipate that the Code would affect the ethics of only a wayfaring 10 percent.

Views Of Honor

A Maryland Editorial

Editor's note: The following are submitted as feelings that have developed about honor codes at various law schools.

It is at this time each year that the Student Advocate can take the opportunity of welcoming back the returning students and also to extend greetings to the incoming freshman class. Perhaps this is the ideal time to make a few cogent comments regarding the importance of the Honor System existent at the Law School. The Honor System, which is administered by the Ethics Committee, is an organ of the Student Bar Association with which the student body as a whole seems least concerned.

The only way in which an Honor System can function properly and achieve a full measure of success is to have the total support of the student body. Without this support, an honor system becomes a meaningless ideal. It should not be difficult for students to envisage a return to the "dark ages" whereby a proctor must be provided to supervise examinations. As future members of the bar, each and everyone of us should be deeply concerned with professional ethics.

A primary purpose of the Honor System is to instill in the student body a spirit of honor and ethical conduct. Each student should sit down at some time during his law school career and familiarize himself with the code of ethics provided by the Student Bar Association. Lack of familiarity with this code can never constitute an excuse for violating its sacred principles. Once a person has committed a serious violation of this code of ethics, it becomes not only an unfortunate happenstance but a moral stigma on the character of the person.

It is to be fervently hoped that no unfortunate incidents of this nature should occur. The best means of insuring that it does not is for the student body as

a whole to more fully inform themselves of the content and meaning of the code of ethics. A man can have no higher or more respectable attributes of his character than to be known as an honest and ethical person. Those who walk the path of honor can know no greater glory and sense of self-respect.

The common law of American educational institutions provides that if a student is caught cheating he will be thrown out. At Rutgers Law School an honor system imposes an additional duty on the student. Besides being upright himself, he must report any derelictions in honor by his fellow students. By his attendance at Rutgers Law School a student is presumed to subscribe to the tenants of the honor system proclaimed in the course catalog and to be on notice that he is subject to punishment if he elects to become an accessory by failing to report a violation of the honor system. This would seem to be sufficient.

However, to "publicize" the honor system in order to "deter cheating" the Honor Code Committee of the Student Bar Association had distributed to each student at registration last month a mimeographed message about the honor code with a pledge at the bottom that those students who felt morally disposed to active enforcement of the code could sign. A list of those who signed was posted for all to see.

Unfortunately, very few who signed the pledge bothered to tear off a copy of what they had endorsed. With three or four people standing behind waiting

Rutgers Speaks Out

for his seat, it is most unlikely that anyone took the time to read what he was signing.

"What is it?" one student was heard to ask as he picked out the honor code sheet from among five or six other forms also requiring his attention.

"Who cares," his classmate replied. "Sign it. Sign everything."

The fact that the honor code statement was later posted along with the list of those who signed does nothing to remedy the lack of conviction with which the signatures were executed.

This lack of conviction is further illustrated by another exchange that was heard at registration.

"Are you going to sign it?" one student asked another.

"Do you think I would let it go in my record that I did not sign an honor pledge?" the other replied. Both signed.

Worse than the questionable validity of the signatures, however, are the effects of posting the signatures. At best the public display served to tell anyone disposed to cheat whom not to sit next to. A more likely, a more indivious, effect was to foster the implication that people who did not sign were either potential cheaters or against Honor. Pro-

Continued From Page 3

From A Virginia Student

From a University of Virginia student: As you will note, the honor system here at the University of Virginia is entirely under the guidance of the students. There are only two possible results of an honor trial: whether the accused is found not to have committed the offense, in which case he is com-

pletely exonerated and all records of the trial are destroyed, or the accused is found guilty and dishonorably discharged from the University. There is no appeal from the decision of the Honor Committee, and the case may only be re-opened upon the production of new and relevant evidence.

Instill Honor

Every student signs an honor pledge upon entering the University, and every effort is made to fully acquaint him with strict burdens imposed under the system. It is assumed that every student, as a gentleman of the University, understands the meaning of the offenses of lying, cheating and stealing. These standards will of course change over the years, but one of the theoretical virtues of trial by a man's peers is that the Honor Committee will likewise reflect these changes in attitude. The fact that the honor system here at the University has been in continuous existence since the 1830's attests to its acceptance by the student body as the cornerstone of student life.

Strength From Tradition

It is my opinion that the above systems gains most of its strength from traditional practice, and therefore I feel it would not be the most feasible system were it to be instituted anew today. I am concerned mostly with the lack of an appeal to a higher administrative body—a faculty committee, for example. Mature reflection should prevail where inexperienced student passions might result in an unwise decision.

If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to write.

Freshmen Begin Moot Court

By JACK JENNINGS

With the twenty-four survivors of the 1966-67 Moot Court competition scheduled to begin arguments this week, the freshman class will soon become the center of attention, as they engage in their "practice" semester of intra-club competition. The hypothetical cases, between four and six in number, were handed out on Jan. 30th. The briefs are to be written by Fed. 20th, with the actual arguments scheduled to run from Feb. 27 through March 2. The briefs, which are to follow the Kentucky Court of Appeals form, are limited to fifteen pages and compromise forty percent of the final grade, with the arguments themselves being worth sixty percent.

Last year's winners from the clubs became this year's advisers, with each club also having a faculty adviser. The clubs themselves are formed from the orientation groups, as supplemented by the signatures of those who failed to register. There will be twelve clubs this year, including the "Gilliam Club" named after Professor Richard Gilliam, who has been a tireless contributor of his time and energy to Moot Court activity here at the University.

Alumni News

Edited by JIM COBLIN

Bert T. Combs, LL.B. '37, has been nominated by President Johnson to a federal judgeship of the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Robert Clark Stone, LL.B. '41, has recently become the Executive Director of the "Kentucky Peace Officers' Standards and Training Council" with the College of Applied Arts and Technology at Eastern Kentucky University.

Honorable Squire R. Williams, LL.B. '42, has been named to a term as Chief Justice on the Court of Appelas of Kentucky.

Bertel M. Sparks, LL.B. '48, professor at New York University School of Law, is this year a visiting professor at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

Charles Coy, LL.B. '51, of Richmond, has recently been elected President of the Kentucky Bar Association.

Fred J. Coplin, LL.B. '52, has joined the firm of Kincaid, Wilson, and Trimble in Lexington.

William C. Van Inwegen, LL.B. '59, has also recently joined the firm of Kincaid, Wilson, and Trimble in Lexington.

Jude P. Zwick, LL.B. '60, has recently been promoted to the position of tax manager in the Chicago office of Arthur Anderson & Co.

Robert Bruce Lankford, J.D. '66, has recently accepted a position in the University of Kentucky administration as assistant counsel

ATTENTION ALUMNI:

Since radio waves move at the speed of light, an exchange of messages with a civilization 500 light years away would take 1000 years. Such intercourse would be of interest only to societies of great stability and longevity. — The Times. And the messages themselves could be on the dull side. — The New Yorker.

But remember alumni, it takes only a few minutes to address a postcard to: University of Kentucky College of Law c/o Student Bar Association Lexington, Kentucky

Law students are the most important segment of the legal profession as far as the Office of Economic Opportunity Legal Services Program is concerned, according to that federal agency's Director, Mr. Earl Johnson.

Mr. Johnson's remarks were addressed to the December 17 American Law Student Association Conference on the Role of the Law Student in Extending Legal Services to the Poor held in Chicago, Illinois.

The new ideas, the new concepts and the new changes in the law are largely attributable to the new blood that has come into the legal aid movement through this program, Mr. Johnson told the delegates from nearly 20 Midwestern law schools at the ALSA conference.

The basic goals of the OEO Legal Services Program are 1) rendering advice and representation to individuals and groups of poor people; 2) educating the poor to know their rights and responsibilities and to know when they should see a lawyer; 3) improving laws and procedures relating to the poor.

Mr. Johnson also informed the ALSA conferees how their law schools could obtain OEO funding for legal aid programs. The OEO has funded university clinics at the University of Detroit School of Law, the University of Notre Dame Law Schools, several West Coast law schools, and The Law School of Harvard University.

OEO Director Calls Students Most Important

The ALSA Legal Aid Conference also heard from the Honorable James B. Parsons, Federal District Judge, Northern District of Illinois. He praised the law schools which, in recent years, have strengthened their curricula in criminal law and have introduced undergraduate and graduate programs for involving students in the field of criminal law.

Nearly one-half of the law schools have developed clinical programs in which undergraduate students work for legal aid and defender agencies under the supervision of their faculty members, Judge Parson noted.

But the judge issued a stern warning to the bar and law firms. Both because the bar as a whole has a professional obligation to strengthen criminal practice and because young men with breadth of experience can contribute greatly to the life of a law firm, law firms should cooperatively agree not to discourage prospective associates from short stints in criminal defense or prosecution work.

There is sufficient imagination and freedom of action in the American bar to devise ways, orthodox or unorthodox, for meeting the critical need for manpower in this important field, Judge Parsons concluded.

The conference program also included a discussion of the particular problems and techniques of interviewing an indigent client by Mr. Henry W. Kenoe, noted

Chicago attorney, and Dr. Michael Peszke, Asst. Professor of Psychiatry, University of Chicago.

The ALSA Conference Workshops looked into the areas of 1) launching, improving and expanding law school legal aid and assistance programs; 2) consumer credit and the poor; 3) court rules and statutes permitting student court appearances and practice; 4) student participation in defender projects and bail programs.

The texts of Mr. Johnson's and Judge Parson's addresses will soon appear in the ALSA STUDENT LAWYER JOURNAL.

Similar ALSA Conferences on the Role of the Law Student in Extending Legal Services to the Poor are scheduled this Spring for both the East Coast and the West Coast.

RUTGERS SPEAKS OUT

Continued From Page 2

moting this form of self - incrimination is not a proper function of an enlightened student government.

There are enough worthwhile projects for the Student Bar to undertake without its members wasting their valuable time and energy on such a meaningless endeavor.

News From Around The Law School

Edited by TIM CONE

Faculty Notes

Acting Dean Paul Oberst has been named chairman of the Kentucky Human Rights Commission. Professor Oberst has served on the commission since 1962 and participated in drafting the 1966 Civil Rights Law.

Several additions to the faculty were made in September. Teaching on a full-time basis, after having previously taught part-time, are Assistant Professor C. G. Williamson, Jr., J.D.-Michigan, LL.M.-Georgetown, and Robert G. Lawson LL.B.-Kentucky. New members are Assistant Professors A. Dan Tarlock, LL.B.-Stanford, Raymond Ellinwood, LL.B.-Chicago, and William E. Bivin, LL.B.-Kentucky. Visiting Professor Robert Sedler has previously taught at Rutgers, St. Louis, and Haile Selassie II University. Joe C. Savage, LL.B.-Kentucky, LL.M.-Harvard, is conducting a seminar in Medico-Legal.

The first occupant of the Moreland chair will be Professor Gerhard Mueller, the renowned specialist in criminal law, who is presently at New York University.

Legal Fraternities

Rush has been the main order of business for the legal fraternities at the moment. Phi Alpha Delta and Delta Theta Phi sponsored the traditional beer blast, while Phi Delta Phi held their annual Libel Show.

January 23 was "pledge day" at the College of Law, after much competition among the fraternities, ninety-six students pledged. However, pledging will continue for several more days.

Delta Theta Phi

Those pledging Delta Theta Phi were: Bob Willmott, Paul Saffer, Bruce Stith, Tate Combs, John Burns, Don Mintmire, Henry Vance, Emmett McCall, John Eldred, Ron Daniels, Bob Wilson, Greg Wehrman, Joe Miller, Dick Wildt, Tom Cosentino, Howell Brady, Gayle Robbins, Mike Hughes, Bob Smith, George Geoghagan, Richard Roof, Bob Fears and Jim Brickey.

Wayne Townes, Dave Satterfield, Bob Penn, Paul Issacs, James Howard, Charlie Wheeler, Bob Murphy, Carl Lambert, Jim Ckarke, Jim Coleman, Stokes Baird, Mike Kranitz, Jerry Grigsby, Wayne Shepherd, Dean Rice, Bill Mills, Dave Powell, Jack Underwood, Baxter Bledsoe, Tom Hall, Kevin Baldwin, Tony Barraco, Van Cramb, Henry Rosenthal, Steve Spiller.

Phi Alpha Delta

Larry Moore, Jim Brennan, Jack Keith, Jimmy Robinson, John J. Hill, Morton Hoagland, Lewis Knox, Carl Hurst, Ken Alexander, Perry Lewis, J. B. Yonts, John Parton, Jerry Wilson, Eli George, Walter Pitio, and Terry Anderson.

Phi Delta Phi

Vic Fox, David Fife, Bob Coots, Clint Newman, Brandon Haynes, Stephen Sanders, Larry Tweel, Woodford Gardner, Buddy Bishop, Gerald Benzinger, Frank Berry, Curtis Wells, Jim Brien, Mike Johnson, Butch Devers, Elmer George.

Sonny Martin, John Adams, Ray Larson, Frank Dickey, Ed Glasscock, Gary Foltz, Tom Rogers, Tom Martin, Dave Deep, Bill Jones, Jim Richards, Dave Denton, and Buzz Hulette.

Speakers Forum

Watson Clay, Commissioner of the Court of Appeals, gave the first lecture of the second semester. The subject of his speech was the Kentucky Rules of Civil Procedure.

Others invited to participate in the semester's program are Judge Marlow Cook, Louie Nunn, Henry Ward.

Law Journal

Thirty freshmen and three second-year students have been selected by the Kentucky Law Journal to participate in the new competitive candidacy program. From these candidates, approximately twenty students will be chosen as members on the basis of their performance in a competitive program of research, analysis, editing, and writing.

A new method of selection of candidates was introduced this year. Rather than select the top thirty students in the class, fifteen were chosen from each of the two sections. Because the students were in direct competition with each other in the sections, this was felt to be a more equitable method.

Section One Candidates

Those students selected from the first section are: Rutheford Campbell, Gary Herfel, Douglas Bricker, William Howard, Kay Alley, Bill Cunningham, John Eldred, Charles Glasscock, Ken Alexander, Woodford Gardner, James Brickey, William Baird, James Howard, Vance Cramb and William Bishop.

Section Two Candidates

Section two candidates are: Michael Schaffield, Leslie Rankey, Joseph Miller, Larry Kelley, John Reisz, Lawrence Tweel, Bob Fears, John Smith, Robert Spragens, Carl Lambert, Clinton Newman, Larry Langah, James Whitlow, George Kurr, and Baxter Bledsoe.

Three second-year students became eligible for the candidacy program by being in the top twelve percent of their class after their third semester. They are Kathy Fitzgerald, John Richardson, and Mrs. Carolyn Connell.

Law Day

Two persons have accepted the offer to participate in the Law Day Symposium on "Legal Aid and the Poor." The main participant will be Earl Johnson, Director of Legal Services for the Office of Economic Opportunity. T. Edward Austin, Public Defender of Jacksonville, Florida has also accepted.

Also invited to take part is Edward K. Wright, Little Rock, Arkansas, who is Chairman of Professional Ethics Chair-chairman of Professional Ethics Committee of the ABA.

The Kentucky Commentator

HENRY ROSENTHAL, Editor

TIM CONE, Associate Editor

JOE FOSTER, Circulation

JACK JENNINGS, Feature Editor

RICHARD HOLT, Business Manager

JIM COBLIN, Alumni Affairs

ROBERT VILES, Faculty Adviser

SBA Board of Governors: Mitch McConnell, president; Frank Reaves, vice-president; Ann Truitt, secretary; John McCann, treasurer; Duane Schwartz, third year representative; Clyde Richardson, second year representative; Bruce Stith, first year representative.

Published monthly except during December and January by the Student Bar Association of the University of Kentucky, Lexington. The Commentator is distributed to all the Alumni, faculty and students. A limited distribution is made to the general campus. Editorial offices are in Room 17 of the Law Building. The University extension number is 2611.

Permission is given for reproduction of any part of an article appearing in the Commentator, provided credit is given to both the Commentator and the author if the article is bylined.

Law Schools Establish Interviewing Program

In response to a growing demand for a set of orderly procedures to guide prospective employers and law students through the interviewing process, fifteen leading law schools have issued a joint statement setting forth their recommendations.

The recommended procedures were worked out in consultation with members of the practicing Bar. If the statement meets with general approval, it is possible that improvements of a more far-reaching nature may be suggested in the future. The six points contained in the September 1966 Statement are as follows:

1. Prospective employers offering positions in the fall to third-year students seeking permanent employment should leave their offers open until at least December 1st, provided the students (if requested to do so) reaffirms his interest in the offer. Third-year students should endeavor to conclude their law office interviews prior to December 1 unless a good reason exists for interviewing at a later date.

2. No guide lines are suggested this year with respect to the time or place of interviewing second-year students, since each school may prefer to adopt its own rules on this subject. It is hoped, however, that all prospective employers will keep their offers to second-year students open for a reasonable period of time after the offer is made.

3. Prospective employers should advise candidates of their status at the close of an interview either by giving the student a definite invitation at that time to visit the interviewer's office (to be confirmed subsequently by letter) or by

informing the student that if an invitation is to be extended, he will hear by a stated date or within a specified period of time.

4. In the interest of their classmates students should act as promptly as possible in both accepting the declining offers. Students receiving multiple offers should immediately notify all other prospective employers from whom they have received offers.

5. Students should advise prospective employers if they are candidates for fellowships, judicial clerkships, or other temporary activities.

6. First-year students should not call on the law firms concerning summer employment without first consulting the Placement Office, since most large and medium sized law firms do not offer summer clerkships to first-year men.

The schools issuing the statement are: Boston University Law School, Brooklyn Law School, Columbia University School of Law, Cornell Law School, Duke University School of Law, Fordham University School of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, Harvard Law School, New York University School of Law, St. John's University School of Law, Syracuse University College of Law, University of Michigan School of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School, University of Virginia School of Law, Yale Law School.

Legal Aid Conference Successful At Chicago

If the turnout at ALSA's first legal aid conference held in Chicago December 17 is any indication of its success, ALSA members can expect many more of such undertakings in the future.

Students and faculty from law schools in the Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Circuits gathered at the University of Chicago's Kellogg Center of Continuing Education for a full day of discussion and study of the problems encountered by legal aid organizations when rendering assistance to the indigent.

The conference, chaired by George Matish, national vice president of the Sixth Circuit, began with a seminar dealing with the techniques that should be used when interviewing the indigent client. Also part of the program were four legal aid workshops. The topics were "Legal Problems of the Poor," "Court Rules Allowing Students to Practice Law," "Launching and Administering Legal Aid Clinics" and "Legal Aid and Defender Programs."

Highlighting the program was the keynote speech by Earl Johnson, director of legal services for the Office of Economic Opportunity. A luncheon for the delegates was held at the Center.

Matish termed the conference as a

success and said: "This program was the first of its kind for ALSA. We can look forward to more topically oriented conferences dealing with the substantive areas of the law. In fact, another is being planned for the month of March, in California."

ALSA, ABA To Meet In Houston

On February 10, ALSA's Board of Governors while attending the convention in Houston, Texas, will join with members of the American Bar Association's Board of Governors to discuss the planned merger of ALSA into the ABA. Also planned is a discussion of the possibility of providing discount rates for students who want to attend ALSA's national convention in Honolulu.

Matish will attend the four day Houston conference and hopes to meet with the Circuit's Student Bar Presidents immediately after returning.

Final arrangements are being made for the Circuit's annual convention to be hosted by Detroit's Wayne State University Law School March 17-19.



Front row 1. to R.—Earl Cornett, Elmer Cunnagin, Dick Adams, Alan Peck, and coach Jim (Man in the Brown Khakis) Elam. Back row—Dennis Bradley, John Adams, Dave Yewell and Larry Conley.

Legal Eagles Win Despite Tough Foes

While "Rupp's Runts" have run into their troubles this season, Elam's Eagles have been holding their own against some top flight competition.

Elam's Eagles better known as the Legal Eagles have handed the UK freshmen a preseason scrimmage defeat. Coached by Jim Elam, the Eagles are 3-4 counting preseason and regular season games.

The Eagles have defeated Eastern freshmen twice, but were defeated in a third engagement. Georgetown edged the young lawyers 83-82 and Transylvania's varsity handed the Eagles an 84-81 loss.

In a game played on the Memorial Coliseum floor the talented UK Kittens revenged the preseason loss by trouncing the Eagles 123-85. Coach Elam was disappointed at the outcome of the game, but was proud of the way his boys fought. He pointed out that the first semester final grind had taken much out of his team.

Elam was not overly pleased with the officiating at the Georgetown game. He does not seem to be alone on that point as far as University coaches go this season.

Elam objectively pointed out that a key member of the team was missing during the two other defeats suffered by the team.

Averaging over 6-4, the Legal Eagles offensive thrust centers around four former collegiate players. Leading the team in scoring is 6-3 Larry Conley who played on last season's NCAA runnerup team. Conley is averaging 38.5 points a game. In the two games with the Kittens, Conley got 48 and 44 points. When the Eagles lost to Transy, Conley was not available.

Conley's running mate at guard is Bob Rose, 6-3, former Clark County all-

stater who attended the University of Georgia on a basketball scholarship. Knee trouble sidelined Rose at Georgia. He is averaging 7.1.

At forward are 6-5 Dennis Bradley and 6-5 Dave Yewell. Bradley was a top-flight prep player at Lexington Lafayette and later went on to play intercollegiate at Eastern. He is fourth in Eagle scoring with an average of 11.5 a game.

Yewell, who did his collegiate playing at Transylvania is number two in scoring with an 18.5 scoring average. Yewell said that the passing of Conley has contributed greatly to the scoring by the other members of the team.

The pivot man for the Eagles is John Adams, former center for the Wildcats. Adams has been the team's top rebounder while compiling an 18.1 scoring average. He did not play in the loss to the Eastern freshmen.

Others on the team are Earl Cornett who has a 3.0 average (basketball-wise), Elmer Cunnagin, 1.5, Dick Adams and Alan Peck, non-scorers. Peck did demonstrate a tenacious defense in the game with the Kittens at the Coliseum.

FROM AFRICA TO UK

Continued From Page 1

tering American colleges from secondary schools.

"The amazing thing," Prof. Sedler said, "is that relatively they did so well. There is one student from the Ethiopian law school studying at Harvard and another at UCLA. Last year saw the first class graduated. Seventeen students completed the course of study. Prof. Sedler, who was assistant dean, said there were 25 in the second year class and 30 in the first year class.

Phi Delta Phi Presents:

Libelous Scenes From The Libel Show

